

REMARKS

Claim 27 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Applicants have cancelled claim 27 without prejudice.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Chang et al. (US 6,425,775). Claims 3, 8, 9, 14, 19, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang et al. (US 6,425,775) in view of Reichardt et al. (US 5,370,544). The examiner is requested to reconsider these rejections.

Claims 10, 11, and 21-26 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). It is submitted that Chang fails to teach each and every element as set forth in claims 1-3 and 12-14 for at least the reasons described below.

Claim 10 has been cancelled without prejudice and its features have been added to claim 1. In view of page 4, last paragraph of the office action, claim 1 should now be in condition for allowance.

Though dependent claims 2-9 contain their own allowable subject matter, these claims should at least be allowable due

to their dependence from allowable claim 1. However, to expedite prosecution at this time, no further comment will be made.

Claim 21 has been cancelled without prejudice and its features have been added to claim 12. In view of page 4, last paragraph of the office action, claim 12 should now be in condition for allowance.

Though dependent claims 13-20 and 23-26 contain their own allowable subject matter, these claims should at least be allowable due to their dependence from allowable claim 12. However, to expedite prosecution at this time, no further comment will be made.

Claims 28 and 29 have been added above to further claim the features recited therein.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now present in the application are clearly novel and patentable over the prior art of record. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested. Should any unresolved issue remain, the examiner is invited to call applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Appl. No.: 10/523,125
Reply to Office Action of: 07/05/2006

Respectfully submitted,

Mark F. Harrington

Mark F. Harrington (Reg. No. 31,686)

10/4/06

Date

Customer No.: 29683

Harrington & Smith, LLP
4 Research Drive
Shelton, CT 06484-6212
203-925-9400

CERTIFICATION OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below.

10-4-06

Date

Ann Okrentowich

Name of Person Making Deposit